

**LONG BEACH AIRPORT TERMINAL AREA
IMPROVEMENT PROJECT
DRAFT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT NO. 37-03**

SCH NO. 200309112

City of Long Beach
Planning and Building Department
333 West Ocean Boulevard
Long Beach, California 90802

Contact: Angela Reynolds
(562) 570-6354

November 2005

**LONG BEACH AIRPORT TERMINAL AREA
IMPROVEMENT PROJECT
DRAFT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT NO. 37-03

SCH NO. 200309112**

Prepared for:

City of Long Beach
Planning and Building Department
333 West Ocean Boulevard
Long Beach, California 90802

Contact: Angela Reynolds
(562) 570-6354

Prepared by:

BonTerra Consulting
Mestre Greve Associates
CDM
Meyer, Mohaddes Associates, Inc.
Jones & Stokes
RBF Consulting

November 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
List of Acronyms	viii
1.0 Executive Summary	1-1
1.1 General Introduction	1-1
1.2 Purpose and Scope of This EIR	1-1
1.3 Project Setting	1-1
1.3.1 Project Location	1-1
1.3.2 Physical Setting	1-1
1.3.3 Regulatory Setting	1-1
1.4 Project Description	1-2
1.5 Project Objective	1-3
1.6 Areas of Controversy and Issues to be Resolved	1-4
1.7 EIR Focus and Effects Found Not to be Significant	1-5
1.8 Organization of the EIR	1-9
1.9 Referenced Documents and Availability of Studies and Reports	1-9
1.10 Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Program	1-10
1.11 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Program for the Optimized Flights Scenario.....	1-21
1.12 Alternatives.....	1-24
2.0 Project Description	2-1
2.1 Project Location.....	2-1
2.2 Project Setting	2-1
2.2.1 Environmental Setting.....	2-1
2.2.2 Regulatory Setting	2-2
2.2.3 Transportation Security Administration	2-4
2.3 Project Objectives	2-4
2.4 Project History	2-5
2.4.1 2003 Notice of Preparation and Scoping Meetings	2-5
2.4.2 Airport Advisory Committee	2-6
2.4.3 2005 Notice of Preparation and Scoping Meetings	2-6
2.5 Project Description	2-7
2.5.1 Proposed Project	2-7
2.5.2 Alternative A	2-15
2.5.3 Alternative B	2-16
2.5.4 Alternative C	2-16
2.6 Project Phasing	2-17
2.7 Operational Considerations.....	2-17
2.8 Intended Uses of the EIR	2-18
3.0 Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures	3-1
3.1 Aesthetics.....	3.1-1
3.1.1 Existing Conditions	3.1-1
3.1.2 Impact Analysis.....	3.1-4
3.1.3 Mitigation Program.....	3.1-13
3.1.4 Level of Significance After Mitigation.....	3.1-14
3.2 Air Quality and Human Health Risk Assessment	3.2-1
3.2.1 Existing Conditions	3.2-15
3.2.2 Impact Analysis.....	3.2-31
3.2.3 Mitigation Program.....	3.2-50
3.2.4 Level of Significance After Mitigation.....	3.2-58

**TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Continued)**

<u>Section</u>		<u>Page</u>
3.3	Cultural Resources.....	3.3-1
3.3.1	Existing Conditions	3.3-3
3.3.2	Impact Analysis.....	3.3-6
3.3.3	Mitigation Program.....	3.3-15
3.3.4	Level of Significance After Mitigation.....	3.3-17
3.4	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	3.4-1
3.4.1	Existing Conditions	3.4-4
3.4.2	Impact Analysis.....	3.4-11
3.4.3	Mitigation Program.....	3.4-19
3.4.4	Level of Significance After Mitigation.....	3.4-20
3.5	Land Use and Relevant Planning.....	3.5-1
3.5.1	Environmental Setting/Existing Conditions	3.5-1
3.5.2	Impact Analysis.....	3.5-11
3.5.3	Mitigation Program.....	3.5-20
3.5.4	Level of Significance After Mitigation.....	3.5-20
3.6	Noise	3.6-1
3.6.1	Existing Conditions	3.6-14
3.6.2	Impact Analysis.....	3.6-17
3.6.3	Mitigation Program.....	3.6-25
3.6.4	Level of Significance After Mitigation.....	3.6-27
3.7	Public Services.....	3.7-1
3.7.1	Existing Conditions	3.7-1
3.7.2	Impact Analysis.....	3.7-4
3.7.3	Mitigation Program.....	3.7-13
3.7.4	Level of Significance After Mitigation.....	3.7-14
3.8	Transportation and Circulation	3.8-1
3.8.1	Existing Conditions	3.8-6
3.8.2	Impact Analysis.....	3.8-9
3.8.3	Mitigation Program.....	3.8-22
3.8.4	Level of Significance After Mitigation.....	3.8-23
4.0	Alternatives to the Proposed Project.....	4-1
4.1	Introduction.....	4-1
4.2	Proposed Project Summary	4-1
4.2.1	Proposed Project Objectives	4-1
4.2.2	Project Related Impacts.....	4-1
4.3	Description of Alternatives Carried Forward.....	4-4
4.3.1	Alternative A	4-6
4.3.2	Alternative B	4-7
4.3.3	Alternative C	4-7
4.4	Description of Alternative Considered But Not Carried Forward	4-7
4.4.1	Alternative D	4-7
4.5	Environmentally Superior Alternative	4-8
5.0	Long Term Implications of the Proposed Project	5-1
5.1	Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes Which Would Be Caused by the Proposed Project Should It Be Implemented	5-1
5.2	Growth-Inducing Impacts	5-2
5.3	Cumulative Impacts	5-4
5.3.1	Introduction.....	5-4
5.3.2	Cumulative Impact Analysis.....	5-6

**TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Continued)**

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
6.0 Summary of Mitigation Measures.....	6-1
7.0 References.....	7-1
8.0 List of Preparers and Contributors	8-1
9.0 Glossary	9-1

Appendices

- A Initial Study/Notice of Preparation
- B Guiding Principles for Terminal Design Concepts
- C Air Quality and Human Health Risk Assessment
- D Cultural Resources
- E Environmental Data Resources, Inc. Report
- F Noise Report and Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance
- G Traffic Report

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1.10-1	Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures	1-11
1.11-1	Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures Related to the Optimized Flights Scenario.....	1-22
2.5-1	Long Beach Airport Passenger Terminal Area Improvements EIR Alternatives	2-9
2.6-1	Long Beach Airport Terminal Area Improvement Project Construction Phasing Estimate	2-17
3.2-1	Project Phasing	3.2-6
3.2-2	National and California Ambient Air Quality Standards.....	3.2-16
3.2-3	South Coast Air Basin Attainment Status.....	3.2-17
3.2-4	10-Year Ambient Air Quality Trends in the Vicinity of Long Beach Airport.....	3.2-22
3.2-5	10-Year Ambient Air Quality Trends in the Vicinity of Long Beach Airport – Days Above the Standards.....	3.2-23
3.2-6	Existing Ambient Air Quality in the Vicinity of Long Beach Airport and Ambient Air Quality Standards	3.2-24
3.2-7	Long Beach Airport Emissions Compared to Regional Emissions.....	3.2-25
3.2-8	Trend in TAC Cancer Risk from 1998 to 2004 in the Vicinity of Long Beach Airport.....	3.2-26
3.2-9	2005 Existing Conditions Criteria Pollutant Emission Inventory.....	3.2-27
3.2-10	Current Maximum CO Concentrations at Roadway Intersections in the Vicinity of the Airport	3.2-28
3.2-11	SCAQMD Regional Pollutant Emission Thresholds of Significance.....	3.2-31
3.2-12	Project Construction Emission Inventories.....	3.2-33
3.2-13	Future Ambient Air Quality in the Vicinity of Long Beach Airport with Optimized Flights Operational Contributions.....	3.2-35
3.2-14	Incremental Operational Emissions with Optimized Flights Compared to Significance Thresholds	3.2-36
3.2-15	TACs of Concern for Acute Exposure During Construction	3.2-38
3.2-16	Estimated Highest Incremental Cancer Inhalation Risks	3.2-38
3.2-17	Summary of Project Multi-pathway Incremental Cancer Risks for Adult Resident.....	3.2-39
3.2-18	Estimated Highest Incremental Chronic Non-Cancer Inhalation Health Hazards.....	3.2-40
3.2-19	Maximum Acute Hazard Index for Acrolein	3.2-40
3.2-20	Comparison of Cal/OSHA Permissible Exposure Limits (PEL-TWA) to Maximum Estimated 8-hour On-Airport Concentrations for 2011 Optimized Flights Conditions.....	3.2-42
3.2-21	Consistency of the Proposed Project with Air Quality Related Goals and Policies.....	3.2-43
3.2-22	Fugitive Dust Control Actions for Exemption to Monitoring (Rule 403 Table 2)	3.2-52
3.2-23	Required Best Available Control Measures (SCAQMD Rule 403, Table 1)	3.2-53
3.2-24	Track out Control Options	3.2-56
3.4-1	UST Sites (Active and Historical) at Long Beach Airport	3.4-5
3.4-2	HAZNET Sites at Long Beach Airport	3.4-5
3.4-3	Consistency of the Proposed Project with Hazards and Hazardous Waste-Related Goals and Policies.....	3.4-16
3.5-1	Schools Within Four Kilometers of Long Beach Airport	3.5-3
3.5-2	Consistency of the Proposed Project with Land Use-Related Goals and Policies.....	3.5-13
3.6-1	Long Beach Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance SENEL Limits	3.6-9
3.6-2	Budget Categories and Allocated Budget	3.6-11

**LIST OF TABLES
(Continued)**

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
3.6-3	Number of Potential Additional Flights by Aircraft Type	3.6-14
3.6-4	Year 2004 Measured CNEL at Long Beach Airport	3.6-15
3.6-5	Night Air Carrier and Cargo Operations for 2004	3.6-17
3.6-6	Exterior Noise Limits Per Long Beach Municipal Code Section 8.80.202	3.6-18
3.6-7	Maximum Terminal Area Construction Noise Levels at Receptors Across Lakewood Boulevard	3.6-19
3.6-8	Maximum Parcel O Construction Noise Levels at Receptors Across Clark Avenue	3.6-20
3.6-9	Comparison of Land Use Impacts, Number of Residences and Schools	3.6-22
3.6-10	Comparison of Existing and Future CNEL Comparison of Existing and Future CNEL Values at Remote Monitoring Terminal Locations	3.6-23
3.7-1	Fire Fighting Resources Available to the Airport	3.7-2
3.7-2	Security Resources Available to the Airport	3.7-3
3.8-1	Trip Generation Methodology Comparison	3.8-3
3.8-2	Level of Service Criteria for Signalized Intersections	3.8-4
3.8-3	Level of Service Criteria for Unsignalized Intersections	3.8-5
3.8-4	Existing Weekday Peak-Hour Intersection Levels of Service	3.8-7
3.8-5	Existing Plus Optimized Flights Scenario Peak-Hour Intersection Levels of Service	3.8-12
3.8-6	2020 No-Project Optimized Flights and 2020 Proposed Project With Optimized Flights Peak-Hour Intersection Levels of Service	3.8-15
3.8-7	Congestion Management Plan Freeway Analysis	3.8-17
3.8-8	Evaluation of Applicable Planning Documents	3.8-20
4.3-1	Long Beach Airport Passenger Terminal Improvements EIR Alternatives	4-4
4.5-1	Comparison of Impacts by Alternative	4-10

LIST OF EXHIBITS

<u>Exhibit</u>		<u>Follows Page</u>
2-1	Regional Location.....	2-1
2-2	Local Vicinity	2-1
2-3	Existing Terminal Area Facilities	2-1
2-4	Generalized Area of Terminal Improvements.....	2-8
2-5	Concept Floor Plan.....	2-8
2-6	Elevations of Conceptual Design	2-8
2-7	Airport Parcel Map – Selected Properties	2-14
3.1-1	View Perspective of Conceptual Design from Land Side	3.1-6
3.1-2	View Perspective of Conceptual Design from Air Side.....	3.1-6
3.1-3	Visual Simulation – Proposed Parking Structure.....	3.1-9
3.3-1	Existing Airport Terminal Photograph.....	3.3-4
3.3-2	View Perspectives of Conceptual Design.....	3.3-10
3.3-3ab	Examples of Character Defining Features	3.3-10
3.3-4	Examples of Area of Impact	3.3-11
3.5-1	General Plan Land Use Map	3.5-1
3.5-2	Airport Parcel Map – Selected Properties	3.5-4
3.5-3	Zoning Map	3.5-7
3.6-1	Examples of Various Sound Levels.....	3.6-1
3.6-2	Typical Outdoor Noise Levels in Terms of CNEL.....	3.6-3
3.6-3	Causes and Prevalence of all Awakenings	3.6-4
3.6-4	Sleep Disturbance Research.....	3.6-4
3.6-5	Example of Community Reaction to Aircraft Noise	3.6-4
3.6-6	FAA Part 150 Noise Compatibility	3.6-6
3.6-7	Monitor Locations	3.6-9
3.6-8	Budget User Group Allocation (RMT 9).....	3.6-10
3.6-9	Year 2004 CNEL Contours.....	3.6-15
3.6-10a	A320, B727, B757-300 and B767-300 Arrival SEL Contour.....	3.6-16
3.6-10b	CL601, GIV, and MD83 Arrival SEL Contour	3.6-16
3.6-11a	B767-300, CL601, GIV, and MD83 Departure SEL Contour	3.6-16
3.6-11b	A320, A320 (Stage 1), B757, and B757-300 Departure SEL Contour	3.6-16
3.6-12	Long Beach Municipal Noise Ordinance	3.6-18
3.6-13	Typical Construction Noise Levels	3.6-19
3.6-14	Year 2005 CNEL Contours with 11 Additional Air Carriers and 25 Additional Commuter Flights	3.6-21
3.6-15	1985 Part 150 Noise Compatibility Plan Contours	3.6-21
3.6-16	Residential Uses Within 65 CNEL Contour (Existing and Future).....	3.6-25
3.6-17	Schools Within 60 CNEL Contour (Future)	3.6-25
3.8-1	Traffic Study Intersections.....	3.8-1
3.8-2	Trip Distribution AM & PM	3.8-3
3.8-3	Existing Peak Hour Volumes – AM(PM).....	3.8-6
3.8-4	Existing with Optimized Flights – Peak Hour Volumes – AM(PM)	3.8-10
3.8-5	2020 No-Project with Optimized Flights – Peak Hour Volumes – AM(PM)	3.8-13
3.8-6	2020 Proposed Project with Optimized Flights – Peak Hour Volumes – AM(PM)	3.8-13

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AAAI	Acoustical Analysis Associates, Inc.
AAC	Airport Advisory Commission
ACGIH	American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists
ACM	Asbestos Containing Materials
ACP	Asbestos Concrete Pipe
ADAP	Airport Development Aid Program
ADD	Average Daily Dose
ADPM	Average Day-Peak Month
AELUP	Airport Environs Land Use Plan
AERMIC	American Meteorological Society/Environmental Protection Agency Regulatory Model Improvement Committee
AERMOD	AERMIC Dispersion Model
AIP	Airport Improvement Program
ANCA	Airport Noise and Capacity Act
ANOMS	Airport Noise and Operations Monitoring System
AOA	Air Operations Area
APU	Auxiliary Power Units
AQMP	Air Quality Management Plan
ARB	Air Resources Board
ARFF	Airport Rescue and Firefighting
AST	Aboveground Storage Tank
ATSA	Aviation and Transportation Security Act
AVGAS	Aviation Gasoline
BACT	Best Available Control Technology
BMPs	Best Management Practices
CAA	Federal Clean Air Act
CAAQS	California Ambient Air Quality Standards
Cal/EPA	California Environmental Protection Agency
Cal/OSHA	California Occupational Safety and Health Administration
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CAPCOA	California Air Pollution Control Officers Association
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CATEF	California Air Toxics Emission Factor
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CAA	Clean Air Act
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CDF	Character Defining Feature
CDI	Chronic Daily Intakes
CDMG	California Division of Mines and Geology
CERCLIS	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System
CHMIRS	California Hazardous Material Incident Report System

CMP	Congestion Management Program
CNEL	Community Noise Exposure Level
CNG	Compressed Natural Gas
CO	Carbon Monoxide
COPC	Chemical of Potential Concern
CORRACTS	Correction Action Report database
dB	Decibel
dBA	A-Weighted Noise Level
D/C	Demand/Capacity ratio
DNL	Day Night Noise Level
DPM	Diesel (Exhaust) Particulate Matter
DTSC	Department of Toxic Substances Control
ECOC	Emergency Communication and Operations Center
EDMS	Emissions and Dispersion Modeling System
EDS	Explosives Detection System
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EMFAC	Emission Factor Model for On-Road Mobile Sources
EMS	Emergency Services
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
ERNS	Emergency Response Notification System
ETD	Explosives Trace Detection
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration
FAR	Federal Aviation Regulation
FBOs	Fixed Base Operators
FEIR	Final Environmental Impact Report
FICON	Federal Interagency Committee on Noise
FICAN	Federal Interagency Committee on Aviation Noise
FID	Facility Inventory Database
FINDS	Facility Index System
FOA	First Order Approximation (of aircraft PM emissions)
GA	General Aviation
GANC	General Aviation Noise Committee
GIS	Geographic Information System
GSE	Ground Support Equipment
HAZNET	Government records database containing hazardous waste manifests.
HC	Hydrocarbon (also Total Hydrocarbon)
HCM	Highway Capacity Methodology
HHRA	Human Health Risk Assessment
HMS	Los Angeles County Industrial Waste and Underground Storage Tank Sites database
HNL	Hourly Noise Level

HSCP	Health and Safety Contingency Plan
Hz	Hertz
ICAO	International Civil Aviation Organization
ICU	Intersection Capacity Utilization
INM	Integrated Noise Model
IRIS	Integrated Risk Information System
ISCST3	Industrial Source Complex Short-Term Model, Version 3.0
ITE	Institute of Transportation Engineers
LADD	Lifetime Average Daily Dose
LBP	Lead Based Paint
LEED	Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design
LEQ	Equivalent sound pressure level
LGB	Long Beach Airport
Lmax	Maximum Noise Level
LOS	Level of Service
LPG	Liquid Propane Gasoline
LTO	Landing/Takeoff Operation
LUST	Leaking Underground Storage Tank
MAP	Million Annual Passengers
MATES-II	Multiple Air Toxics Exposure Study
MEI	Maximum Exposed Individuals
MEK	methyl ethyl ketone
MLD	Most Likely Descendent
MM	Mitigation Measure
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MRI	Midwest Research Institute
MTA	Metropolitan Transportation Authority
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NASP	National Airport System Plan
NCDC	National Climatic Data Center
NCP	National Contingency Plan
ND	Negative Declaration
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NFRAP	No Further Remedial Action Planned
NOP	Notice of Preparation
NO _x	Oxides of Nitrogen, specifically nitric oxide (NO) and nitrogen dioxide (NO ₂)
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NPL	National Priorities List
OEHHA	Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration

Pb	Lead
PD	Planned Development
PDF	Project Design Feature
PEL	Permissible Exposure Limit
PGP	Planning Grant Program
PM	Particulate Matter
RAATS	RCRA Administration Tracking System
RAGS	Risk Assessment Guide for Superfund
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RCRA-TSD	RCRA permitted Treatment, Storage, Disposal
REF	Hazardous Waste Government database
REL	Reference Exposure Level
RfD	Reference Dose
RMT	Remote Noise Monitoring Terminal
ROC	Reactive Organic Compounds
RON	Remaining Overnight
RTP	Regional Transportation Plan
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SARA	Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act
SB	Senate Bill
SC	Standard Condition
SCAG	Southern California Association of Governments
SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
SCCIC	South Central Coastal Information Center
SCH	State Clearinghouse
SCL	State CERCLIS database
SEIR	Supplemental Environmental Impact Report
SEL	Sound Exposure
SENEL	Single Event Noise Exposure Level
SIDA	Security Identification Display Area
SIP	State Implemented Plan
SoCAB	South Coast Air Basin
SPILLS	ERNS and State Lists
SPL	State Equivalent Priority List
SQG/LQG	Registered Small or Large Generators of Hazardous Waste
SWLF	Solid Waste Landfill List
SWPPP	Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
TAC	Toxic Air Contaminant
TIA	Traffic Impact Analysis
TIM	Time in Mode
TRIS	Toxic Release Inventory System
TSA	Transportation Security Administration

USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
USGS	United States Geological Survey
US/OSHA	United States Occupational Safety and Health Administration
UST	Underground Storage Tank
V/C	Volume-to-Capacity ratio
VMT	Vehicle Miles Traveled
VOC	Volatile Organic Compound
WDID	Waste Discharge Identification number
WDS	Waste Discharge System
χ/Q	Chi-Over-Q, Concentration-to-Emissions Ratio

SECTION 1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 GENERAL INTRODUCTION

The environmental impact report (EIR) process, as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (CEQA) (Public Resources Code 21000 *et. seq.*) as amended, requires the preparation of an objective, full-disclosure document to: a) inform agency decision makers and the general public of the direct and indirect environmental effects of a proposed action; b) identify, where feasible, mitigation measures to reduce or eliminate any identified significant adverse impacts; and c) identify and evaluate alternatives to the proposed project which might lessen or avoid some or all of the identified significant impacts of the project.

1.2 PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THIS EIR

The City of Long Beach (City) has prepared this EIR to address the potential environmental impacts associated with improvements to the Long Beach Airport (the Airport). The project is described in detail in Section 2.0, Project Description. In conformance with CEQA (Public Resources Code 21000 *et seq.*), this EIR assesses the potential individual and cumulative impacts of the Proposed Project. The City, as the lead agency, will review and consider the Long Beach Airport EIR in its decision to approve, revise, or deny the project.

1.3 PROJECT SETTING

1.3.1 PROJECT LOCATION

The Proposed Project would be implemented at Long Beach Airport in the City of Long Beach, Los Angeles County. The street address for the Airport is 4100 East Donald Douglas Drive, Long Beach, California. Aviation activities are located just north of Interstate-405 ("I-405") and generally bound by Cherry Avenue to the west, City of Lakewood and the Boeing Property to the north, and Lakewood Boulevard to the east. I-405 and several arterials surround the Airport; however, public access to the terminal area is gained only from Lakewood Boulevard on the east side of the Airport. The Proposed Project also provides for the potential use of Parcel O for possible temporary vehicular parking and for replacement tie-downs for general aviation aircraft when the additional aircraft parking spaces are provided. Parcel O is located on the southern portion of the Airport in the vicinity of Clark Avenue and Willow Street.

1.3.2 PHYSICAL SETTING

Presently, the Airport covers 1,166 acres and has five (5) runways, the longest being 10,000 feet. The Airport serves commercial carriers, general aviation, and air cargo. The area surrounding the Airport is a mix of commercial, industrial and residential development.

Surrounding uses include existing Boeing property and industrial uses in the City of Lakewood to the north. The City has approved a mixed-use development, known as Douglas Park, as a reuse plan for a portion of the Boeing property. The Skylinks Golf Course and the Airport Business Park are located to the east, and industrial and commercial uses to the south and west of the Airport. Residential development is located east of Clark Street and south of I-405.

1.3.3 REGULATORY SETTING

In 1981, the City of Long Beach adopted a noise control ordinance affecting the Airport that limited the number of air carrier flights at the Airport to 15 flights per day and required the use of quieter aircraft. The purpose of the ordinance was to reduce the "cumulative" noise generated

by the Airport. The ordinance was challenged by the commercial airlines in federal court. Following an injunction by the court, the City formed a task force and prepared an Airport Noise Compatibility Program, pursuant to Federal Aviation Administration ("FAA") regulations.

In an effort to resolve the protracted litigation, the City and the airlines entered into a stipulated settlement agreement. Under the settlement, the City Council would adopt a new Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance. This was enacted as Chapter 16.43 of the Municipal Code and permits air carriers to operate a minimum of 41 airline flights per day while commuter carriers are permitted to operate a minimum of 25 flights per day. There are provisions in the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance allowing the number of flights to be increased if the air carrier flights and commuter flights operate below their respective Community Noise Equivalent Level ("CNEL") limits.¹

In 1990, while the City's appeal to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals was pending, Congress passed the *Airport Noise and Capacity Act* ("ANCA"), which limited an airport operator's right to control Stage 3 aircraft.² Included within the ANCA legislation is a "grandfather" provision, which permits the City to continue to enforce the flight and noise restrictions that are contained in the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance (Chapter 16.43). In May 2003, the FAA reaffirmed the "grandfather" status of the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance under ANCA.

Additional discussion of the regulatory setting is provided in Section 2.2.2 of this EIR.

1.4 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Proposed Project provides improvements to the existing Airport Terminal Building and related facilities at the Airport in order to accommodate recent increases in flight activity at the Airport consistent with operational limitations of the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance and the 1995 Settlement Agreement. The Proposed Project includes construction of, or alteration to, the 13 areas listed and described below:

- Holdrooms
- Concession Area
- Passenger Security Screening
- Baggage Security Screening
- Baggage Claim Devices
- Baggage Service Office
- Restrooms
- Office Space
- Ticketing Facilities
- Airline Gates
- Aircraft Parking Positions
- Vehicular Parking
- Traffic and Pedestrian Circulation

The terminal area improvements are being designed to accommodate the 41 airline flights and 25 commuter flights, passengers associated with those flights, and security requirements imposed by TSA. This number of flights is already permitted by Chapter 16.43 of the Municipal Code. This flight level is anticipated to result in approximately 4.2 million annual passengers (MAP) being served at the Airport. Considering all improvements, the size of the terminal area

¹ The Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance can be viewed at the Airport web site at www.lgb.org.

² A "Stage 3 aircraft" means an airplane that has been shown to comply with Stage 3 noise levels prescribed in FAR Part 36, Appendix C.

facilities would increase from 56,320 square feet to 102,850 square feet. There would also be additional area at the Airport that would be covered, though not enclosed in a building. The majority of all the improvements would occur in the vicinity of the existing Airport Terminal Building, the aircraft ramp area, and terminal area parking lot. However, by providing up to 14 aircraft parking positions, the Proposed Project would displace general aviation aircraft that are located on land leased to Million Air Inc. The Proposed Project would relocate the general aviation aircraft to Parcel O, which is currently undeveloped and is located at the south end of runway.

Though not a component of the Proposed Project, the EIR also addresses the impacts associated with up to 52 commercial flights and full utilization of 25 commuter flights. At the time the baseline for this EIR was established, there were no commuter flights operating out of the Airport.³ Subsequently, America West has initiated daily commuter flights and Delta and Smooth Flight Holdings have been conditionally granted commuter flights. All 25 commuter flights are expected to be in regular service between December 2005 and Spring 2006. Both the full utilization of 25 commuter flights at the Airport and the potential increase of up to 11 commercial flights over current operational levels at the Airport (which are the minimum number of commercial flights allowed by the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance) are not causally related to the project proposed facilities improvements. This is the maximum reasonable flight level that could potentially occur with optimized operational procedures and aircraft, and still be within the noise limits ("noise budget") permitted by the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance.⁴ If the additional commercial flights occur, they will result from carrier decisions to optimize flight operations under the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance, rather than the availability of specific terminal area facilities.

The anticipated improvements are described in more detail in Section 2.5, Project Description.

1.5 PROJECT OBJECTIVE

The key project objective is to provide Airport facilities to accommodate the minimum permitted number of flights at the Airport (i.e., 41 commercial flights and 25 commuter flights) and the associated number of passengers served on those flights, in full compliance with all applicable fire, building, safety codes and other applicable standards.⁵ Associated with that objective is the commitment to compliance with the existing Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance adopted for the Airport, and maintaining the current character of the Airport Terminal Building as a Long Beach Cultural Heritage Landmark. The project objectives are provided in greater detail in Section 2.3, Project Objectives.

³ The CEQA Guidelines Section 15125(a) generally directs an EIR to use the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the project, as they exist at the time the notice of preparation is published as the baseline for the EIR.

⁴ The permitted number of flights per day may be increased in each operator flight restriction category as long as the flights operate below the CNEL budgets for that category. In order for the number of flights to be increased and still comply with the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance the airlines would have to optimize their flight operations. This would include using quieter aircraft and reducing the number of late night operations. Under optimal conditions, which have never been achieved at the Airport, the estimated number of increased flights would range between 7 and 11 flights. The EIR will consider 11 flights as a "worst-case" scenario. This is discussed in more detail in Section 3.6, Noise.

⁵ As discussed in Section 2.2.2, Regulatory Setting, the City of Long Beach Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance (Chapter 16.43 of the Municipal Code) provides for a minimum of 41 daily commercial carrier flights and 25 commuter flights. At the time the NOP was issued and the baseline for this EIR was established there were no commuter operations at the Airport. Subsequently, America West has initiated daily commuter flights and Delta and Smooth Flight Holdings have been conditionally granted commuter flights. All 25 commuter flights are expected to be in regular service between December 2005 and Spring 2006.

1.6 **AREAS OF CONTROVERSY AND ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED**

CEQA requires that areas of controversy or unresolved issues be identified up front as part of the EIR. The number of aircraft operations has historically been an area of controversy in the City of Long Beach. As discussed in Section 2.2, Project Setting, there has been a history of litigation and community discourse over the noise associated with commercial air service at the Airport since at least 1981, when the City adopted the Airport Noise Control Ordinance. With settlement of long-standing Airport noise litigation and the adoption of the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance in February 1995, basic parameters for the number of aircraft operations and noise levels were established. However, a number of concerns related to the issue of the number of aircraft, facilities serving the commercial flights, and airport noise still remain. The following are concerns expressed by members of the community through the scoping process. However, it should be noted, that while these issues have been raised, they are not necessarily directly related to the project being evaluated in this EIR.

- Through the scoping process for this EIR the concern has been identified that by providing additional Airport terminal area capacity and increasing the number of aircraft gates there would be increased pressure to revoke or amend the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance. Though the project does not propose any modifications to the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance there is concern by the community that regional planning agencies have identified a need for additional airport capacity in the southern California region. The concern is that by providing improved facilities, other agencies, such as FAA, may look to the Airport to serve a greater amount of the regional demand. However, it should be noted that in May 2003, the FAA reaffirmed the “grandfather” status of the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance under *Airport Noise and Capacity Act* (ANCA). ANCA is discussed in Section 2.2, Project Setting. Additionally, if the City were to take action to modify the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance, CEQA documentation would be required to address the impacts associated with the modifications to the Ordinance.
- As discussed in Section 3.6, Noise, the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance provides noise thresholds or “noise budgets” for various types of aircraft. While the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance provides for a minimum of 25 commuter flights, historically there have been very few commuter flight operations. Some members of the community have expressed a concern that by providing additional facilities that would serve commuter aircraft, the project would encourage commuter operations at the Airport, resulting in greater impacts than currently are experienced. Given that commuter aircraft could operate out of the existing facilities, market factors rather than provision of additional aircraft gates designed for commuter aircraft would have greater influence on whether commuter airlines operate out of the Airport. As discussed above, America West has initiated daily commuter flights and Delta and Smooth Flight Holdings have been conditionally granted commuter flights. All 25 commuter flights are expected to be in regular service between December 2005 and Spring 2006.

In recognition of the concern associated with any increase in flight levels over current levels, the EIR has addressed the potential impacts associated with the full utilization of 25 commuter flights, even though these flights have already been provided for as part of the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance and were addressed in the 1995 environmental documentation for the Ordinance.

- Several members of the community have suggested that the size of the Airport terminal area facilities could be reduced if flights were scheduled throughout the day rather than allowing peaks during the day. While the City regulates the timing of operations through

enforcement of the curfew, the scheduling of individual flights is done by the airlines and is a function of market demand.

- The community expressed concern that the Airport is a source of pollutants that substantially contribute to health risks to those residents and sensitive uses surrounding the Airport. The concern expressed is that any increase in operations would increase these impacts. In response to this concern, a Health Risk Assessment (HRA) has been prepared for the Proposed Project. The HRA addresses not only the terminal area improvements, but also the possible addition of the 11 commercial carrier flights and the full utilization of the 25 commuter flights. The findings of the Health Risk Assessment are presented in Section 3.2, Air Quality and Health Risk Assessment. In addition the potential to encounter asbestos and lead based paint has been identified in Section 3.4, Hazards and Hazardous Material.
- Some members of the community felt that air monitoring and actual testing of people surrounding the Airport should be done as part of the HRA. Protocol for the preparation of the HRA was coordinated with the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) and the Air Resources Board (ARB). These agencies provided direction on how the HRA should be prepared and did not identify a need for air monitoring or testing of residents of Long Beach as part of the technical study for this EIR.

1.7 EIR FOCUS AND EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

In accordance with Section 15063 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the City prepared an Initial Study/Environmental Checklist for the Proposed Project and distributed it along with the Notice of Preparation (NOP) to responsible and interested agencies, and key interest groups. Additionally, scoping meetings were held (Section 2.4, Project History for a discussion of the scoping process). Copies of the NOP/Initial Study, distribution list, and NOP responses are included in Appendix A.

The Initial Study determined that an EIR is required to evaluate the potentially significant environmental effects on the Proposed Project. The EIR addresses all the potential significant effects identified in the environmental checklist. In addition, the EIR provides a discussion of several other issues that were determined not to be significant but will assist the reader in developing a better understanding of the project and the environment in which it would be implemented. In accordance with Section 15128 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the following items were checked “No Impact” or “Less Than Significant Impact,” and do not warrant further evaluation in the EIR:

- Aesthetics – The project is not located within the viewshed of a designated scenic vista or state scenic highway. Improvements would be limited to the area surrounding the existing Airport Terminal Building and would have minimal affect outside the immediate area. The project would not impact any trees or rock outcroppings.

Though the project would result in new lighting at the Airport including, but not limited to, the lighting surrounding the holdrooms, on pedestrian walkways, the parking structure, and apron areas, the improvements and associated lighting would be limited to the area immediately adjacent to the Airport Terminal. This lighting would be adequate for operation, but would not result in an adverse effect on day or night views in the area because lighting would be required to comply with FAA rules and regulations pertaining to minimizing glare and shielding lighting from pilots. The terminal area is set back from other uses off the Airport and is not directly visible from view sensitive uses, such as residential development. The closest existing residential development to the Airport

Terminal area is approximately 3,300 feet to the east and is separated by commercial uses and the Skylinks Golf Course.

The EIR does address aesthetic impacts at the Airport due to changes in the vicinity of the Airport Terminal. However, it does not address visual impacts associated with scenic highways, impacts to natural resources, or from views from adjacent neighborhoods.

- Agricultural Resources – The Proposed Project would not result in any impacts to farmlands listed as “Prime,” “Unique,” or of “Statewide Importance” based on the 2002 Los Angeles County Important Farmland Map prepared by the Department of Conservation. The study area is generally designated as “Urban and Built-Up Land.” There would be no conflict with Williamson Act contracts or result in pressure to convert farmland to other uses.
- Biological Resources – The proposed Airport improvements would be constructed on a portion of the Airport that is currently developed/paved to support airport-associated activities. The project would not have any direct impact on biological resources because it would not result in the removal of any sensitive habitat or impact any sensitive species. The project would not change the type of operations or operational procedures at the Airport; therefore, the project would not result in substantial interference with the movement of wildlife or migration of birds. Given the history of flights at the Airport, it can be assumed that the existing wildlife has habituated to the noise and other indirect impacts associated with aircraft operations. Additionally, as part of the regular operation of the Airport, the City has incorporated measures such as a Bird Hazard Reduction Plan, to reduce potential direct impacts to wildlife species. The Airport has also contracted with a falconer who traps and relocates raptors from the runways and approach ends of the Airport.
- Geology and Soils – The area of the proposed improvements is relatively flat and with the exception of Parcel O is currently covered by an impervious surface. Construction activities would expose the underlying soils; however, the overall area exposed would be limited. The project site would not be prone to geotechnical constraints such as slope instability or landslides because the site is relatively flat. Though all of southern California is exposed to seismic hazards, the Long Beach Seismic Safety Element of the General Plan indicates the site would have a low potential for liquefaction. Additionally, a recent geotechnical survey conducted by the City of Long Beach for the existing parking structure at the Airport concluded that the potential for the site to be significantly impacted by earthquakes, seismic ground shaking, liquefaction, landslides, substantial soil erosion, or unstable or expansive soil is limited. Implementation of standard conditions, such as compliance with the Uniform Building Code and seismic safety standards would reduce the risks to a level of less than significant. No septic tanks are proposed as part of the project.
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials – The project would not result in a significant hazard from the transport of hazardous materials. Nor would the project alter the Airport’s practices regarding the handling of hazardous materials, fueling, or other maintenance or operational procedures.

The project is consistent with the provisions of the Airport Land Use Plan, in that it is providing facilities to support the ongoing airport operations. The project does not propose any changes in the number of flights, the flight patterns, or the operational procedures at the Airport that would result in increased safety hazards offsite.

The project would not alter or interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Access to the project site is off of Lakewood Boulevard, which is not designated as an evacuation route.

The project site is not located in an area subject to wildland fires. The area surrounding the Airport is urbanized and the conditions for wildland fires do not exist in close proximity.

The EIR does not provide a discussion of handling of hazardous materials and transport of hazardous materials; consistency with the Airport Land Use Plan; conflict with evacuation routes; or wildland fires.

- Hydrology and Water Quality – The Proposed Project involves the development of improvements to the terminal area. The improvements would not result in a substantial increase in impervious soil, or result in increased runoff. Only development of Parcel O would result in the increase of impervious area. This development would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or affect the quality or quantity of the groundwater table.

The Federal Clean Water Act establishes a framework for regulating potential surface water quality impacts, mandating sewage treatment, and regulating wastewater discharges, and requires communities and industries to obtain National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") permits to discharge storm water to urban storm sewer systems. The NPDES program is administered by the California Regional Water Quality Control Boards ("RWQCB"). The Airport has its own separate Industrial NPDES permit that it must comply with (CAS000001/WDID 4B19S004985). The Industrial Permit is generally more stringent than the Municipal Storm Water Permit because it treats the Airport as a point source discharge, rather than a non-point discharge. The Permit requires the Airport and its tenants to maintain a number of Best Management Practices (BMPs) and requires the Airport to conduct periodic testing of stormwater runoff. Through this program the City would be able to identify pollutant levels in excess of established thresholds. Monitoring in past years has not identified water quality issues associated with the Airport. The requirements of this permit, which applies to the entire Airport site, would address the long-term water quality issues associated with the Proposed Project.

Construction activities that disturbs more than one acre would also have to abide by the State issued State Water Resources Control Board Order 99-08 General Permit CAS000002. As part of this process, the Airport would be required to prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP is required to identify BMPs for the control of potential erosion, siltation, and other water quality impacts that may occur during construction. A SWPPP typically contains a list of target structural and non-structural best management practices, which would be used to control, prevent, remove, or reduce pollution. In addition to the requirements of the NPDES program, provisions of the Uniform Building Code, grading permits requirements, and Fire Code provisions include elements that also require reduction of erosion and sedimentation impacts.

Hydrology and water quality is not discussed in the EIR.

- Land Use and Planning – Under the Land Use section, the CEQA checklists asks if the project would physically divide an established neighborhood. The Proposed Project would not result in any direct impacts to an established community because all improvements would occur onsite. Since there would be no physical impacts offsite, this

has not be discussed in the EIR. Additionally, the CEQA checklist asks if would be a conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. There is not an adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan adopted for the project area. The project site is developed and would not provide high value habitat. Consistency with this type of planning effort has not be discussed in the EIR.

- Mineral Resources – The project site has not been identified by the California Division of Mines and Geology ("CDMG") as having mineral commodities in sufficient quantities to be mined commercially. The EIR does not analyze impacts to mineral resources.
- Population and Housing – The Proposed Project would not result in the displacement of housing or a large number of people. The Proposed Project would not result in increased flight levels or substantially increase employment levels that would result in an increased demand for housing in the area. Population and housing has not be discussed in the EIR; however, the potential for growth inducing impacts is included in the EIR.
- Public Services – The project would not increase the demand on public schools, parks, or other public services because it would not result in an increase in population in the project area. These services have not be discussed in the EIR. Potential impacts to police and fire services are discussed in the EIR.
- Recreation – The project would not generate any increase in population or provide development that would result in increased usage of existing neighborhood and regional parks. There would not be any physical deterioration to existing recreation facilities due to the project. This issue has not be analyzed in the EIR.
- Utilities and Service Systems – Though the project would be expected to have an incremental increase in water demand and wastewater production because there would be additional facilities, this would only result in slight increases in peak flow rates. The overall increases would not be substantial enough to require expansion of existing facilities. For the Airport, the number of passengers being served is more of a determining factor in the generation for wastewater rather than the size of the facilities. Given that the number of passengers being served would be the same with any of the alternatives, including the No Project Alternative, the project would not be expected to exceed capacity of existing facilities. The project would not require a water supply assessment pursuant to Senate Bill (SB) 610 because the size of the improvements is well below the thresholds used in SB 610 or the State Water Code. As part of routine plan check, a Fire Flow Test may be required, though based on discussion with the Long Beach Water Department, the 12 inch water main in Lakewood Boulevard would have sufficient capacity to provide necessary water supply to meet demand. Impacts associated with water service and wastewater treatment have not be analyzed in the EIR.

The project would have the potential to increase the amount of solid waste both through construction and operation of the new facilities. Though the number of passengers would be consistent for each of the project alternatives, it is reasonable to assume that additional waste would be generated with the new facilities because there would be increased concessions and better facilities where passengers may be more inclined to use the concession areas. However, this incremental increase would not be expected to result in a significant impact. The City of Long Beach has developed programs to divert the amount of refuse that is sent to landfills through waste reduction, recycling, and business and government source reduction programs. Additionally, a standard

specification in all City contracts requires that the contractor recycle such construction wastes so these materials are not disposed of in landfills. Further evaluation of this issue was determined not to be necessary.

1.8 ORGANIZATION OF THE EIR

This document has been divided into nine sections. The hard copy (paper) version of the document is bound in two volumes. The electronic version of the document is on one compact disk. The first chapter is a summary chapter that provides an overview of the project and potential environmental impacts. Section 2.0 provides the project description of the Proposed Project and the three alternatives being evaluated at a comparable level of detail. Section 2.0 also outlines the project objectives and intended uses of the EIR. Section 3.0 provides the environmental setting, impacts, and mitigation measures associated with nine topical areas. For each topical area, the thresholds for determining the significance of an impact have been identified. Section 4.0 provides alternatives analysis. Section 5.0 discusses the potential long-term implications of the Proposed Project, including growth inducing impacts and cumulative impacts. All the mitigation measures identified in the EIR are compiled in Section 6.0 to facilitate a review of the measures proposed for adoption as part of this project. Section 7.0 lists the references used in preparing the EIR. Section 8.0 lists the preparers and contributors to the document. A glossary of terms is provided in Section 9.0.

As previously indicated, the document is presented in two volumes. The second volume contains the technical appendices. The technical appendices include the NOP, responses to the NOP, transcripts from the scoping meeting, and the technical studies prepared for the project.

1.9 REFERENCED DOCUMENTS AND AVAILABILITY OF STUDIES AND REPORTS

Copies of this Draft EIR, the technical appendices, and cited or referenced studies or reports are available for review at the City of Long Beach, Planning and Building Department, 333 West Ocean Boulevard, Long Beach, Fourth Floor. The EIR and technical appendices are also available for review on the City of Long Beach website (www.lgb.org) and in the following libraries:

Alamitos Neighborhood Library
1836 East Third Street
Long Beach, CA 90802

Bay Shore Neighborhood Library
195 Bay Shore
Long Beach, CA 90803

Brewitt Neighborhood Library
4036 East Anaheim Street
Long Beach, CA 90804

Burnett Neighborhood Library
560 East Hill Street
Long Beach, CA 90806

Dana Neighborhood Library
3680 Atlantic Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90807

El Dorado Neighborhood Library
2900 Studebaker Road
Long Beach, CA 90815

Los Altos Neighborhood Library
5614 Britton
Long Beach, CA 90815

Mark Twain Neighborhood Library
1325 East Anaheim Street
Long Beach, CA 90813

North Neighborhood Library
5571 Orange Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90805

Ruth Bach Neighborhood Library
4055 Bellflower Boulevard
Long Beach, CA 90806

Bret Harte Neighborhood Library
1595 West Willow Street
Long Beach, CA 90810

Main Library
101 Pacific Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90822

Iacoboni Library
5571 Orange Avenue
Lakewood, CA 90712

Signal Hill Library
1770 East Hill Street
Signal Hill, CA 90755

1.10 SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION PROGRAM

Table 1.10-1 presents a brief summary of the potential significant environmental effects of the Proposed Project, measures to mitigate project impacts to the extent feasible, and the expected status of effects following the implementation of the mitigation program.

The Proposed Project provides an opportunity to improve future conditions at the Airport. Table 1.10-1 presents components of the mitigation program that are not required to mitigate impacts of the Proposed Project, but have been recommended because they will provide long term general benefit to the community. Italicized type distinguishes these measures from the mitigation measures required to address impacts of the Proposed Project.

The mitigation program is comprised of project design features (PDF), standard conditions and regulations, and mitigation measures, which all serve to reduce potential environmental impacts. The more detailed evaluation of these issues, as well as the full text of the mitigation program, is presented in Section 3.0 and also duplicated in Section 6.0. The lengthier of the mitigation measures are summarized in the Table 1.10-1. A number is provided at the end of each summarized measure in the table, which provides the number reference of the full text in the mitigation program. The mitigation measures identify who is responsible, when the action would be implemented and who would be the approving authority, if applicable. The abbreviation PDF refers to the Project Design Feature that has been incorporated into the project, SC is the standard condition that would be applicable to the project and MM is the mitigation measure being proposed. The mitigation monitoring program will be developed using the full text of the mitigation program. In Table 1.10-1, the significance of each impact is indicated by the following abbreviations that parenthetically follow the summary description of the effect: B=beneficial, S=significant impact, LS=impact that is less than significant according to the State CEQA Guidelines, and NI=no impact.

**TABLE 1.10-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level Of Significance After Mitigation/Status Of The Mitigation Measure
Aesthetics (Section 3.1) The Planned Development zoning regulations and design guidelines establish standards for improvements at the Airport that address potential visual impacts. The design of the Proposed Project would comply with applicable design standards for development at the Airport. (NI)	<p>Prior to building plan approval, the Planning Commission shall ensure that all development complies with the development standards and design guidelines contained in Ordinance No. C-7496, Development and Use Standards for the Long Beach Airport Terminal Planned Development Plan (PD-12). (SC 3.1-1)</p> <p>Prior to building plan approval, the Cultural Heritage Commission shall ensure that any new construction proposed adjacent to the Terminal building or attached onto it shall comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic buildings, and more specifically, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (Standards). (SC 3.1-2)</p> <p>Prior to building plan approval, the Cultural Heritage Commission shall ensure that all development shall comply with the May 7, 1990 MOU adopted by the City Council and Cultural Heritage Commission providing guidelines for future environmental review of the Airport Terminal building (the MOU is contained in Appendix B). (SC 3.1-3)</p>	No Impact.
The Proposed Project would alter views of the project site during construction activities, potentially resulting in short-term aesthetic impacts. (SI)	<p>During construction activities, the construction contractor shall ensure that construction materials and equipment staging areas be located away from existing residential uses and, when feasible, appropriate screening (i.e., temporary fencing with opaque material) shall be used to buffer views of the construction site. (MM 3.1-1)</p> <p>During construction activities, the construction contractor shall ensure that temporary construction-related security lighting shall be arranged so that direct rays will not shine on or produce glare for adjacent street traffic and residential uses. The light fixtures specified for the Project design must comply with the standard of the Illuminating Engineering Society for full cutoff capability. (MM 3.1-2)</p>	Less than significant.
The Proposed Project would result in construction activities and expansion of the terminal facilities. This could result in light and glare impacts associated with security lighting and light emanating from the proposed improvements. (SI)	<p>Prior to building plan approval, the Planning Commission shall ensure that all exterior lighting be designed and located as to avoid intrusive effects on the runway operations, so as not to result in an air safety hazard. Low-intensity street lighting and low-intensity exterior lighting shall be used throughout the development to the extent feasible. Lighting fixtures shall use shielding, if necessary to prevent spill lighting on adjacent off-site uses. (MM 3.1-3)</p>	Less than significant.

TABLE 1.10-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level Of Significance After Mitigation/Status Of The Mitigation Measure
	Prior to building plan approval, the Planning Commission shall ensure that all development projects use reflective glass that is less than 20 percent and all other materials used on exterior buildings and structures shall be selected with attention to minimizing reflective glare. (MM 3.1-4)	
Air Quality and Health Risk Assessment (Section 3.2)		
Project related construction activities would result in significant short-term construction related air quality impact for NO _x and VOC. (SI)	<p>During construction of the Proposed Project, the City and its contractors will be required to comply with regional rules that would assist in reducing short-term air pollutant emissions. SCAQMD Rule 402 requires that air pollutant emissions should not create a nuisance off-site. SCAQMD Rule 403 requires that fugitive dust be controlled with the best available control measures so the presence of such dust does not remain visible in the atmosphere beyond the property line of the emission source. (SC 3.2-1)</p> <p>The contract specifications shall require and the City shall enforce that all building materials, architectural coatings, and cleaning solvents comply with all applicable SCAQMD rules and regulations. (SC 3.2-2)</p> <p>The contract specifications shall require and the City shall enforce general contractors to ensure that all construction equipment is properly tuned and maintained in accordance with manufacturers' specifications. (MM 3.2-1)</p> <p>The contract specifications shall require and the City shall enforce general contractors to maintain and operate construction equipment so as to minimize exhaust emissions. During construction, engines on trucks and vehicles in loading and unloading queues will be turned off when not in use, to reduce vehicle emissions. Construction activities should be phased and scheduled to avoid emissions peaks and discontinued during second-stage smog alerts. (MM 3.2-2)</p> <p>The contract specifications shall require and the City shall enforce general contractors sweep streets as needed during construction, but not more frequently than hourly, if visible soil material has been carried onto adjacent public roads. (MM 3.2-3)</p> <p>The contract specifications shall require and the City shall enforce general contractors to visually inspect construction equipment prior to leaving the site; loose dirt shall be washed off with wheel washers as necessary. (MM 3.2-4)</p>	Significant.

TABLE 1.10-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level Of Significance After Mitigation/Status Of The Mitigation Measure
	<p>During construction, the City shall coordinate with the contractor to maximize the ability to power construction activity utilizing electricity from power poles rather than temporary diesel or gasoline power generators, to the extent possible. (MM 3.2-5)</p> <p>The contract specifications shall require that all on-site mobile equipment used during construction shall be powered by alternative fuel sources (i.e., methanol, natural gas, propane, or butane) where feasible. (MM 3.2-6)</p> <p>During construction the City of Long Beach shall provide a location and require the contractor to store all construction equipment used in the project construction within the project site (away from adjacent residential areas) to reduce the impact on the roadway system and the resultant air emissions. On-site construction equipment staging areas and construction worker parking lots shall be located on either paved surfaces or unpaved surfaces that are periodically treated with non-toxic soil stabilizers. (MM 3.2-7)</p> <p>The contract specifications shall require and the City shall enforce the contractor to schedule all deliveries related to construction activities that affect traffic flow during off-peak hours (e.g., 10:00 am and 3:00 pm) and deliveries shall be coordinated to achieve consolidated truck trips. When traffic flow is impacted by the movement of construction materials and/or equipment, temporary traffic controls shall be provided to improve traffic flow (e.g., flag person). (MM 3.2-8)</p> <p>The contract specifications shall require all on-site heavy-duty construction equipment shall be equipped with diesel particulate traps where feasible .to the extent that this equipment is available at the time the contracts are awarded. (MM 3.2-9)</p> <p>The contract specifications shall require and the City shall enforce that emulsified diesel fuel will be used in diesel-fueled construction equipment that is not equipped with diesel particulate traps to reduce NO_x emissions. (MM 3.2-10)</p>	
<p>Though no impact has been identified associated with long term use of the terminal facility, through application of standard conditions pertaining to project design and operation of the Airport air emissions would be minimized. (LS)</p>	<p>As part of project design, the City of Long Beach shall ensure the terminal area improvements are designed and constructed to meets LEED specifications. (PDF 3.2-1)</p> <p>The contract specifications shall require and the City shall enforce that the design of the terminal improvements meet LEED standards. All new</p>	<p>Beneficial.</p>

TABLE 1.10-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level Of Significance After Mitigation/Status Of The Mitigation Measure
	<p>and substantially modified buildings shall meet California Title 24 Energy Efficiency standards for water heating, space heating and cooling, to the extent feasible. (SC 3.2-3)</p> <p>The contract specifications shall require and the City shall enforce that all new and modified point source facilities (e.g., utility equipment, fuel storage and dispensing) obtain all required permits from the SCAQMD. To obtain these permits, the facilities will need to include Best Available Control Technology (BACT) that reduces emissions of criteria pollutants. (SC 3.2-4)</p> <p>The contract specifications shall require and the City shall enforce that all exterior lighting use color-corrected low sodium lighting. (SC 3.2-5)</p> <p><i>The following measures are recommended where the Proposed Project would have an opportunity to further reduce emissions resulting in a net benefit from the Proposed Project.</i></p> <p><i>During project design, the architect shall provide that all fixtures used for lighting exterior common areas are regulated by automatic devices to turn off lights when they are not needed. (MM 3.2-11)</i></p> <p><i>As part of the air carrier ramp design, the City of Long Beach shall incorporate electric charging stations infrastructure to support operation of electric GSE and other on-airport vehicles. (MM 3.2-12)</i></p> <p><i>As part of the air carrier ramp design, preconditioned air and 400 Hz power from electric units (or electric power grid) will incorporate provisions at the commercial passenger aircraft parking positions to allow aircraft pilots the ability to plug in at the gate and turn off the APU. (MM 3.2-13)</i></p> <p><i>Ultra-low sulfur diesel fuel will be provided for diesel-fueled GSE that are not readily convertible to electrical power. (MM 3.2-14)</i></p> <p><i>Through its lease language with them, the City of Long Beach shall require the airlines to comply with the South Coast GSE Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) signed by the airlines and CARB in December 2002 or replacement agreements and/or regulations. Through the implementation of MM 3.2-12 and MM 3.2-13, the Airport will design the infrastructure necessary to assist airlines in complying with the GSE MOU. The GSE MOU includes provisions for retrofitting diesel GSE with particulate traps where feasible. Therefore, compliance with the GSE</i></p>	

TABLE 1.10-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level Of Significance After Mitigation/Status Of The Mitigation Measure
	<i>MOU will reduce PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} impacts as well as NO_x and VOC emissions. (MM 3.2-15)</i>	
Cultural Resources (Section 3.3)		
<p>The Proposed Project would result in alterations to a designated historical landmark. (SI)</p>	<p>Project design incorporates the following guidance documents to protect the historic integrity of the existing terminal: (1) May 7, 1990, memorandum of understanding (MOU) by the Neighborhood and Historic Preservation Officer for the City of Long Beach providing guidelines for future environmental review of the Airport terminal building; (2) Secretary of the Interior's standards for rehabilitation of historic buildings;(3) Development and Use Standards for the Long Beach Airport Terminal Planned Development Plan Ordinance adopted by the City Council on September 2, 1997; (4) the City's Cultural Heritage Ordinance (Chapter 2.63 of the Municipal Code); and (5) a memorandum on considerations for new construction prepared by PCR (June 22, 2005). (PDF 3.3-1)</p> <p>In compliance with Chapter 2.63 of the Municipal Code no permits for the alteration, remodel, enlarging, or improvements to the Airport Terminal, shall be issued prior to review by the Cultural Heritage Commission and issuance by the Commission of a certificate of appropriateness. (SC 3.3-3)</p> <p>As part of Airport Terminal design, the project architect shall place any connection between the new structure and the 1941 Airport Terminal beneath the existing cornice, to be consistent with the Streamline Moderne design. (MM 3.3-1)</p> <p>As part of Airport Terminal design, the project architect shall ensure that window treatments reference the style of the original Airport Terminal windows. (MM 3.3-2)</p> <p>The windows on the south elevation, first story, were removed and the spaces filled in during the 1984 improvements. One section now exhibits a tile mosaic, which shall be left in place. As part of Airport Terminal design, the window closest to the southwest corner wall shall be returned or replicated to its original appearance, if feasible (Secretary's Standard #6). (MM 3.3-3)</p> <p>During project design, the project architect shall reference the style of the doorframes on the east and south facades for the new doorway proposed for the north side of the building. (MM 3.3-4)</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

TABLE 1.10-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level Of Significance After Mitigation/Status Of The Mitigation Measure
	<p>The exterior material should be compatible in type, color and finish to the existing material used on the original Airport Terminal building. (MM 3.3-5)</p> <p>During project design, the proposed shelter/ticketing area on either side of the existing Airport Terminal shall be scaled down. This can be done with either a lower profile, possibly with a flat roof that fits in visually with the horizontal nature of the architectural style of the Airport Terminal. (MM 3.3-6)</p>	
<p>Because of the low probability of discovery of archaeological and paleontological resources, impacts were determined to be less than significant. Implementation of standard conditions would ensure less than impacts if resources were discovered during construction. (LS)</p>	<p>Should any archaeological resources be uncovered during grading or excavation activities, these activities shall be diverted to a part of the site away from the find, and a qualified archaeologist shall be contracted by the contractor to: (1) ascertain the significance of the resource; (2) establish protocol with the project applicant to protect such resources; (3) ascertain the presence of additional resources; and (4) provide additional monitoring of the site, if deemed appropriate. If human remains are discovered on the site, the Los Angeles County Coroner shall be contacted to examine the remains, and the provisions of Section 15064.5(3) of the CEQA Guidelines shall be followed. (SC 3.3-1)</p> <p>If human remains are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition of the materials pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The County Coroner must be notified of the find immediately. If the remains are determined to be prehistoric, the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC will determine and notify a Most Likely Descendent (MLD). With the permission of the landowner or his/her authorized representative, the MLD may inspect the site of the discovery. The descendent must complete the inspection within 24 hours of notification by the NAHC. The MLD may recommend scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials. (SC 3.3-2)</p> <p>Should any paleontological resources be uncovered during grading or excavation activities, the construction contractor shall divert activities to a part of the site away from the find, and a qualified paleontologist shall be contracted by the contractor to: (1) ascertain the significance of the resource; (2) establish protocol with the project applicant to protect such resources; (3) ascertain the presence of additional resources; and</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

TABLE 1.10-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level Of Significance After Mitigation/Status Of The Mitigation Measure
	(4) provide additional monitoring of the site, if deemed appropriate. If human remains are discovered on the site, the Los Angeles County Coroner shall be contacted to examine the remains, and the provisions of Section 15064.5(3) of the CEQA Guidelines shall be followed. (SC 3.3-4)	
Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Section 3.4)		
During construction, asbestos containing materials could be disturbed and introduced into the environment. (SI)	<p>Compliance with SCAQMD Rule 1403 (SC 3.4-3 and SC 3.4-4)</p> <p>Prior to the initiation of demolition/construction, the Contractor shall develop an approved Health and Safety Contingency Plan (HSCP) in the event that unanticipated/unknown environmental contaminants are encountered during construction. The plan shall be developed to protect workers, safeguard the environment, and meet the requirements of the CCR, Title 8, General Industry Safety Orders – Control of Hazardous Substances. The Plan shall include measures for handling any unknown wastes or suspect materials discovered during construction by the Contractor, which he/she believes may involve hazardous waste or hazardous materials.</p> <p>The HSCP should be prepared as a supplemental to the Contractor's Site-Specific Health and Safety Plan, which should be prepared to meet the requirements of CCR Title 8, Construction Safety Orders. (MM 3.4-1)</p>	Less than significant.
During construction, lead-based paint could be introduced into the environment. (SI)	Prior to the demolition of any on-site building or portion of any on-site building constructed prior to 1973, the City shall screen the buildings for lead-based pain and mitigate in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local regulatory requirements. (MM 3.4-2) MM 3.4-1, provided above would also apply to this potential impact.	Less than significant.
During grading activities at Parcel O, DDT could be introduced into the environment. (SI)	Prior to issuance of grading permits, the applicant shall test the soil for aerially deposited lead and dichloro-diphenyl-trichloroethane (DDT). As a result of soil testing, should aerially deposited lead or DDT be found in quantities that exceed acceptable thresholds, the applicant shall develop a remediation program to dispose of soil material properly. (SC 3.4-9) MM 3.4-1, provided above would also apply to this potential impact.	Less than significant.
During construction, hazardous materials could be transported onto the Airport adjacent to school sites along Willow Street. (SI)	As part of the contract specification, a haul route, which could include Willow Street, shall be designated by the City Engineer, or his designee. During construction, the City Engineer, or his designee shall instruct every contractor that no hazardous or acutely hazardous materials may be transported onto the Airport via Willow Street to avoid potential impacts within one-quarter mile of the Alpert Jewish Community Center, where school programs are conducted. (MM 3.4-4)	Less than significant.

TABLE 1.10-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level Of Significance After Mitigation/Status Of The Mitigation Measure
<p>Project design and existing regulations would ensure the operation of the Proposed Project improvements would minimize potential impacts associated with the handling of hazardous materials. (NI)</p>	<p>The proposed terminal improvements would be constructed in a manner consistent with LEED standards, which among other things, would minimize potential hazards and hazardous waste impacts. (PDF 3.4-1)</p> <p>The Proposed Project and any additional flights associated with optimize flight operations would be required to comply with the provisions of the Long Beach Airport Certification Manual and Long Beach Airport Rules and Regulations pertaining to the handling, use, and disposal of hazardous materials and hazardous wastes. (SC 3.4-1)</p> <p>The Contractor shall develop a SWPPP to minimize potential short-term significant hazardous materials impacts associated with construction activities. (SC 3.4-2)</p> <p>The City Engineer, or his designee, shall verify that every contractor transporting or handling hazardous materials and/or wastes during project implementation has permits and licenses from all relative health and regulatory agencies to operate and properly manifest all hazardous or California regulated material. (SC 3.4-5)</p> <p>The Airport shall comply with the Airport Industrial NPDES permit (CAS000001/WDID 4B19S004985). Construction activities that disturbs more than one acre shall abide by the State issued State Water Resources Control Board Order 99-08 General Permit CAS000002. As part of this process, the Airport would be required to prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). (SC 3.4-6)</p> <p>Construction of the Proposed Project shall be in compliance with local and State construction and building requirements and regulations, including the Uniform Building Code. (SC 3.4-7)</p> <p>During demolition and excavation activities and during preparation of the geotechnical study in the design phase, the City shall have a qualified inspector onsite to inspect and sample the soil for contaminants. If observations during demolition activities indicate that site soil is affected by contaminants, demolition work should be stopped in the area involved until an analysis of the soil conditions can be performed and additional recommendations evaluated and performed as necessary. (MM 3.4-3)</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
Land Use (Section 3.5)		
No impacts were identified with the Proposed Project.	No mitigation is required.	No impacts.

TABLE 1.10-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level Of Significance After Mitigation/Status Of The Mitigation Measure
Noise (Section 3.6)		
Night construction activity on Parcel O may result in noise levels in excess of the noise levels specified in the Long Beach Noise Ordinance if heavy construction equipment associated with grading and paving are used.	<p>The contractor shall comply with the City of Long Beach Noise Ordinance pertaining to limitations on construction activities to the extent feasible while minimizing any potential conflicts with aviation activities. (SC 3.6-2)</p> <p>The City shall conduct noise measurements during any night construction on Parcel O where such construction involves the use of heavy construction equipment such as front loaders, tractors, graders, paving machines, jackhammers or similar devices. Such measurements shall be made near the homes located directly across Clark Avenue from Parcel O. If any night measurement exceeds the limits specified in Sections 8.80.150 and 8.80.160 of the Long Beach Municipal Code as a result of the construction activity, the operation shall be terminated until such time that a construction noise mitigation plan can be put into effect that will result in compliance with the night time noise limits. Note that in the case where ambient noise levels exceed the noise limits specified in Section 8.80.160, the allowable noise exposure standard shall be increased per Section 8.80.150 [C] of the Municipal Code to reflect ambient levels. (MM 3.6-1)</p>	Less than significant.
The Proposed Project would not result in any project related noise impacts. (NI)	The Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance would apply to continued operations at the Airport. All future operations would need to be consistent with the provisions of the ordinance. (SC 3.6-1)	No impact.
Public Services (Section 3.7)		
The Proposed Project would not result in any significant impacts to police and fire services. The improvements would have beneficial effects on security (TSA and Airport security) by providing enhanced facilities. (B)	<p>The Proposed Project would reduce overcrowding and provide an expanded baggage screening area, which would also be enclosed to protect sensitive screening equipment. (PDF 3.7-1)</p> <p>Prior to the initiation of construction activities, the City's contractor shall prepare a Traffic Control Plan to ensure that adequate emergency access is maintained at the Airport during construction. As part of the Traffic Control Plan the contractor shall alert emergency and security service providers of the construction activities for each phase of construction. The Traffic Control Plan shall be submitted to the City Traffic Engineer for approval. (SC 3.7-1)</p>	

TABLE 1.10-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level Of Significance After Mitigation/Status Of The Mitigation Measure
	<p>During project design, the facility improvements shall adhere to TSA, FAA, and all applicable standards including City of Long Beach fire code, building code, and safety code. Long Beach Fire Department shall review and approve design plans as part of the site plan review and building permit processes. (SC 3.7-2)</p> <p>During construction activities, the relocation or modification of TSA facilities shall be coordinated with TSA to ensure that there is no compromise to the TSA function that would adversely affect TSA's ability to perform its passenger and baggage security screening activities. (SC 3.7-3)</p> <p>Prior to initiation of any modifications to the airfield side, the contractor shall provide a Construction Phasing Implementation Plan, meeting the approval of the Airport Manager. The Plan shall demonstrate how construction activities will be conducted and that all applicable FAA airfield safety requirements are being met. In addition, the contractor shall prepare a safety plan and participate in on-going weekly safety meetings during construction. (SC 3.7-4)</p>	
Traffic and Circulation (Section 3.8)		
<p>The Proposed Project provides an opportunity to improve existing and future conditions at the Airport. (NI)</p>	<p>A component of the Proposed Project is the provision of a new parking structure that would accommodate 4,000 vehicles. (PDF 3.8-1)</p> <p>The project would include the extension of the south side of the Donald Douglas Drive loop to exit onto Lakewood Boulevard, with eastbound right turn only to southbound access on to Lakewood Boulevard. (PDF 3.8-2)</p> <p>With the construction of the parking structure, existing surface parking would be displaced. To address potential parking demand during construction, Parcel O would be developed to serve parking demand not met by existing facilities. (PDF 3.8-3)</p> <p>As part of contract specification, the Airport shall require all construction trucks to access the Airport terminal area via the I-605 to I-405 and Lakewood Boulevard. Construction vehicles accessing Parcel O shall use this route and access the construction site off of Clark Avenue or Willow Street. (SC 3.8-1)</p>	<p>Beneficial.</p>

1.11 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION PROGRAM FOR THE OPTIMIZED FLIGHTS SCENARIO

Table 1.11-1 presents a brief summary of the potential significant environmental effects of the Optimized Flights scenario. As with the Proposed Project which is discussed above, the mitigation program for the Optimized Flights scenario is comprised of project design features, standard conditions, and mitigation measures, which all serve to reduce potential environmental impacts. The more detailed evaluation of these issues, as well as the full text of the mitigation program, are presented in Section 3.0 and are duplicated in their entirety in Section 6.0. As with Table 1.10-1, the lengthier mitigation measures are summarized in the table and a number is provided at the end of each summarized measure, which provides the number reference of the full text in the mitigation program. Additionally, mitigation measures that would provide a benefit to the community but are not required to reduce an impact associated with the Optimized Flights scenario is shown in italicized font.

**TABLE 1.11-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES RELATED TO THE OPTIMIZED FLIGHTS SCENARIO**

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level Of Significance After Mitigation/Status Of The Mitigation Measure
Air Quality and Health Risk Assessment (Section 3.2)		
Incremental air quality emissions with the Optimized Flights scenario would exceed SCAQMD's PM ₁₀ concentration threshold due to associated GSE and vehicular traffic activity, contribute substantially to an existing air quality violation, and expose sensitive receptors to significant PM ₁₀ concentrations. (SI)	The mitigation program identified in Table 1.10-1 above would address these impacts.	Significant.
Incremental air quality emissions with the Optimized Flights scenario would exceed SCAQMD's thresholds of significance for CO and NO _x . (SI)	The mitigation program identified in Table 1.10-1 above would address these impacts.	Significant for NO _x ; less than significant for CO and VOC.
Noise (Section 3.7)		
Though the Proposed Project would not result in any project related noise impacts, there are sensitive land uses within the 65 CNEL contour under both existing and Optimized Flights scenario (NI).	Within 24 months of certification of the EIR, the Airport Manager shall develop a land use compatibility program addressing existing and future aviation noise levels. The program shall be an ongoing voluntary program that will provide noise attenuation and be available to all residential units within the 65 CNEL contour and schools within the 60 CNEL contour based on the contours published for Long Beach Airport for the previous calendar year (Quarterly Report for 12 month Period Ending December 31). In exchange for sound insulation treatment, the owners of the property will provide the City of Long Beach a noise easement over said property. The program shall identify (1) methods of providing noise attenuation; (2) funding sources for the improvements; (3) methods for establishing priorities for implementing the improvements; and (4) an installation agreement. The land use compatibility program will be administered by the City of Long Beach, Airport Bureau. (MM 3.6-2)	Beneficial.
Land Use and Relevant Planning (Section 3.5)		
The Optimized Flights scenario has the potential to induce airport land uses beyond the Airport boundary. Specifically, the increased flight levels would require additional vehicular parking beyond the levels provided by the Proposed Project. (SI)	Implementation of MM 3.8-2 requiring the addition of on-site parking in conjunction with allocation of additional flights would address these impacts.	Less than significant.

TABLE 1.11-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES RELATED TO THE OPTIMIZED FLIGHTS SCENARIO

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level Of Significance After Mitigation/Status Of The Mitigation Measure
Transportation and Circulation (Section 3.8)		
The Existing Plus Optimized Flight Scenario would result in significant impacts at the Spring Street/Lakewood Boulevard and the Willow Street/Lakewood Boulevard intersections during the weekday AM peak hour. (SI)	In conjunction with the allocation of additional flights in accordance with the Airport Noise Compatibility Noise Ordinance when the ADPM passenger levels reach 12,700, the Airport Manager shall develop a traffic monitoring program. The traffic monitoring program shall evaluate the LOS at the Spring Street and Lakewood Boulevard and the Willow Street and Lakewood Boulevard intersections. (MM 3.8-1)	Less than significant.
With the Optimized Flights scenario, there would be insufficient parking at the Airport to accommodate the additional passenger levels. (SI)	In conjunction with the allocation of additional flights in accordance with the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance, when the annual passenger levels reach 4.2 MAP, the Airport Manager shall identify and develop additional on-site parking opportunities. (MM 3.8-2)	Less than significant.

1.12 **ALTERNATIVES**

In accordance with Section 15126(f) of the CEQA Guidelines the EIR includes an evaluation of alternatives. Within the body of the report (Section 3.0, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures) the No Project Alternative and two alternatives with less intense development than the proposed project are evaluated. The placement of these alternatives in the body of the EIR is to facilitate the readers understanding of the impacts associated with the alternatives and allow easy comparison of the impacts associated with each alternative. The following provides an overview of each of these alternative and the associated environmental impacts. More detailed descriptions and evaluation of each of the alternatives, including a matrix that provides a detailed breakdown of the square footage assumptions, are described and evaluated in Section 2.5, Project Description. In addition there is one alternative that was considered but not carried forward for full evaluation. This included an alternative that would provide less terminal facilities from what is currently available. The alternatives are also briefly discussed and summarized in Section 4.0, Alternatives to the Proposed Project.

- **Alternative A** – This alternative was based on the improvements proposed in the 2003 NOP, with minor modifications. Alternative A assumes the terminal facility would be a maximum of 97,545 square feet. The nature of the improvements would generally be the same as the proposed project, though compared to the proposed project, there are minor reductions in square footage in all except the following categories:
 - Baggage security screening would be the same as the Proposed Project.
 - No additional space is assumed for ticketing facilities.
 - The amount of airport office space is increased compared to the Proposed Project.

The 2003 NOP assumed 16 aircraft parking spaces. However, the City Council determined in February 2005 that no more than 14 aircraft parking spaces would be evaluated in the EIR; therefore, the 16 aircraft parking spaces presented in the 2003 NOP have been reduced 14 spaces for evaluation in this EIR. Other aspects of the project, such as the number of gates, aircraft parking and vehicular parking would be the same for Alternative A as for the Proposed Project. As with all the alternatives, the EIR evaluates 52 commercial flights and 25 commuter flights for Alternative A. These assumptions are constant with all the alternatives because the number of flights are not causally related to the project proposed facilities improvements, and any impacts would be applicable to all alternatives because they could occur without any project-proposed improvements. If they occur, they would result from carrier decisions to optimize flight operations under the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance, rather than the availability of specific terminal facilities.

The EIR findings determined the impacts associated with this alternative would be very similar to those associated with the Proposed Project. Refer to Table 4.5-1 in Section 4.0 for a summary of impacts for Alternative A.

- **Alternative B** – This alternative further reduces the size of the terminal facilities. This alternative assumes the terminal facility would be a maximum of 79,725 square feet. Similar to Alternative A, the nature of the improvements would generally be the same, though reduced in size compared to the Proposed Project, with the following exceptions:
 - Baggage security screening would be the same as the Proposed Project.
 - No additional space is assumed for ticketing facilities.
 - No additional airport office space is assumed as part of this alternative.

Other aspects of the project, such as the number of gates, aircraft parking and vehicular parking would be the same for Alternative B as for the Proposed Project. As indicated above, all the alternatives would address the impacts associated with 52 commercial flights and 25 commuter flights, as the maximum reasonable flight level.

The EIR findings determined the impacts associated with this alternative would be very similar to those associated with the Proposed Project. Refer to Table 4.5-1 in Section 4.0 for a summary of impacts for Alternative B.

- **Alternative C (No Project Alternative)** – The No Project Alternative assumes that no new facilities would be provided at the Airport. The temporary holdrooms provided at the Airport would remain in place. The terminal, including holdrooms, would be 56,320 square feet. The airline gates would be limited to the eight that currently exists. A total of 10 aircraft parking spaces would be provided at the Airport. The project assumes that the offsite parking would not to be available for lease. No new vehicular parking spaces would be provided.

CEQA requires that the definition of the No Project Alternative include the existing conditions, as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future, if the project was not approved. Therefore, all provisions of the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance would apply to all the project alternatives, including the No Project Alternative. Since under optimal flight operations, the number of commercial flights could reasonably be projected to increase up to 52 daily flights and a minimum of 25 commuter flights are provided for within the Ordinance, these assumptions are also used for the No Project Alternative.

Refer to Table 4.5-1 in Section 4.0 for a summary of impacts for Alternative C.

1.13 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA requires that the EIR identify the environmentally superior alternative. Each of the alternatives (including the Proposed Project) would provide additional capacity that would help serve the number of passengers served by the minimum number of flights provided for in the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance. However, based on the HNTB study (2004) conducted during the scoping process, the recommended sizes of the facilities to best meet the needs for the passengers, visitors, and tenants actually exceeded the square footage allocation of even the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project is able to meet the all the project objectives, including complying with the parameters of the adopted Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance; maintaining the current character of the Airport Terminal Building as a Long Beach Cultural Heritage Landmark; and constructing an operationally and energy-efficient and value-driven design. The Proposed Project does not result in substantially greater impacts than the other build alternatives. Therefore, the Proposed Project is the environmentally superior alternative.